JULY. 1780. THE NUMB. 2615.

PENNSYLVANIA GAZETTE,

AND

WEEKLY ADVERTISER.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1780.

For the PENNSYLVANIA GAZETTE.

NO MY LORD, BUT ALL LORDS in the United States of America.

"Hold Blaſphemer! can frail man be THY LORD?
"Jehovah is."

THE words MY LORD, and MY LORDS, are, without the leaſt ſcruple, ſpoken or written, even by our moſt ſyſtematical republicans; by men, who are endowed with exquiſite ſenſibility, and poſſeſs innumerable advantages, inſeparable from a cultivated underſtanding. It is evident that they do not advert to the idea of ſuperiority, with which the perſons thus addreſſed, or mentioned, are expreſly gratified, by the ſtate, body or individual, who adopt that abject ſtyle.

Some men pretend that this glaring abſurdity ought to be underſtood as an unmeaning compliment. Theſe may have their own reaſons, for wiſhing that ſuch indecent forms be not diſcontinued in our States. But can we, conſiſtent republicans, conſider as *unmeaning* any phraſe, which, in every ſenſe it is ſuſceptible of, exhibits on our part an unintended denial of our Independence?

Should the words *My Lord* and *My Lords* be fairly explained, as they really are underſtood by the Britiſh King, and *his* Lords, the meaning would be reprobated with abhorrence, in Great-Britain itſelf. It would be condemned there, as injurious to the dignity of human nature. But the Britiſh Lords are too cautious to hazard the explanation, at leaſt before their uſurpations have acquired more reality.

They remain ſatisfied for the preſent, with interpreting *amongſt themſelves*, and in the manner which can beſt ſooth their pride, the blind condeſcenſion of the unthinking vulgar. The fear of incurring the ridicule which ſeldom fails to attend ſingularity, contributes towards preventing Commoners of a liberal diſpoſition, from curiouſly inveſtigating the origin of a practice, which does not *ſeem* to eſtabliſh pretenſions that are unfavourable to national liberty. By theſe means, the diſtinction which the Lords have obtained, by the deepeſt cunning, daily receives a greater ſanction. Beſides, the principal Commoners of Great-Britain, having family connexions with *Lords*, expect that they, or ſome of their deſcendents, will likewiſe become *Lords*; and there are but too many of theſe *great* Commoners, who, if their King would but *create* them Lords, are ready to ſell to him the wretched remnant of liberty which Britons ſtill enjoy.

The King of Great-Britain, when addreſſing the Peers of that kingdom, or thoſe of Ireland, ſays "MY LORDS;" and it is worth obſerving, that neither the King nor *his* Lords ever addreſs foreign Lords in that ſtyle, even in the Engliſh language. They conſtantly uſe the word SIR, in Engliſh, and in French, MONSIEUR, which is its equivalent. But, when the King addreſſes one of *his* own Lords in French, or any other language, the Engliſh words *My Lords* are uſed by him, as well as by the Britiſh Lords, who ſpeak to each other; and for the ſame reaſon, every perſon uſes thoſe Engliſh words in every language on the ſame occaſions. No body ſuſpecting that the King would degrade himſelf, when ſpeaking to his own ſubjects, his ſtyle is not queſtioned.

The King's meaning muſt be, that the Britiſh and Iriſh Lords are Lords IN, not Lords OF Great-Britain or Ireland;—not that they are HIS Lords, *his* ſuperiors, LORDS to whom HE belongs, but *Lords* who belong to HIM. Innumerable facts, but too well known to Britons, prove this melancholy truth, to a degree of evidence which no Britiſh King would, as yet, dare to claim, nor *his* Lords ſtoop to acknowledge. But, let the mental reſervations of the King and *his* Lords be what they may, it appears ſtrange that they reſpectively addreſs each other in the ſame ſtyle that they are addreſſed by the King, without reſpect to the relative ſuperiority of title. A Britiſh Duke ſtyles an Engliſh, and even an Iriſh Baron, HIS Lord. "My Lord" is their uniform ſtyle. This myſtery is too intereſting not to be unfolded.

When the Britiſh Peers unanimouſly adopted this paradoxical mode of addreſs, they did not mean that they belonged to *each other*. No, it would have been a groſs abſurdity. Neither did they mean that they were, *collectively*, Lords over *each other*, and none of them, *individually*, over the other. The notion of a SOCIAL COMPACT of the whole people with each other was too ſublime, too patriotic, not only for the laſt age of the feudal tyranny, but even the laſt century. The idea is new, *not* of Britiſh growth, and was unknown when the Britiſh Lords began to *mylord* each other. But the people being excluded from the compact, had there been one, it would have been a ſecret compact of the Lords, and, conſequently, a conſpiracy of the Peerage againſt the people.

The ſupporters of Oligarchy may term this manœuvre an *ingenious* contrivance of the Lords, to be *mylorded* by all, without an enquiry into the various ſignifications of the words MY LORDS, when reſpectively uttered by the King, and the people. It certainly was a conſpiracy, conducted by the Lords, in colluſion with the King; but, vanity being the object, it does not add much to the dignity of the Britiſh Crown or Peerage.

A celebrated writer relates that, about the middle of the laſt century, the Prelates of a kingdom, which is not ſituated at a great diſtance from England, obſerved with diſpleaſure, that the principal grandees of the different States in Europe began, about that time, to be *mylorded* by numbers of their inferiors, dependents, and petitioners, whilſt the dignified clergy could not obtain that envied diſtinction. At laſt, the Cardinals, Archbiſhops, and Biſhops who were at Court, unanimouſly agreed to begin, on the ſame day, to *mylord* each other. The artifice ſucceeded; for, they have been *mylorded* ever ſince by their inferiors, and even by laymen of equal rank, when addreſſing a prelate, *as applicants*.

In other caſes, they have not yet prevailed upon the laity of the higher order to indulge them in this particular. All over Europe, the Britiſh dominions excepted, ſuch diſtinctions are reputed acknowledgments of very great inferiority in the addreſſers. Thus the clergy of a neighbouring kingdom ſtand indebted, for the gratification of their vanity, to the ſucceſsful invention of the Britiſh Peers.

Theſe are ſtyled *My Lords*, at every Court in Europe, by perſons of the higheſt rank, who do not underſtand the Engliſh language: The Engliſh words *My Lords* are invariably uſed, although the converſation be not in Engliſh, as it is done at St. James's. A foreign Prince, who has not learnt that language, or is not properly cautioned, utters the Engliſh words *My Lord*, when he addreſſes in French, or another tongue, the pettieſt Baron of Great-Britain or Ireland. He does not ſuſpect the true ſignification of that form of addreſs. If he did, he would not ſtyle that Baron, nor the greateſt nobleman of any State HIS Lord. Neither could this Baron, without being guilty of high treaſon, admit a foreign Prince to interpret that form of addreſs, and apply it to himſelf, relatively to a Britiſh Lord, in the ſame ſenſe in which a King of Great-Britain is admitted, by *his* Lords, to interpret and apply that phraſe.

The truth is, that foreigners, unacquainted with the Engliſh language, fancy that the words *My Lord* are but one uncompounded word, expreſſing a dignity peculiar to the Britiſh nation; they are told, and all appearances lead them to believe, that to be A MYLORD, or, as they write it, a MILORD, is to be honoured with a dignity, common to the Engliſh "Nobleſſe" of every degree. They are confirmed in that error by the reports of travellers, and by the Britiſh King's ſpeeches, in which, let the language of the tranſlation be what it may, the words *My Lords* are conſtantly read as a ſingle word, "*Milords*." They believe that the King of Great-Britain addreſſes the Britiſh Nobles by the name of that dignity, common to every one of them, and they follow his example.

When the King ſpeaks in French to a Britiſh Lord, in the preſence of foreigners, ſhould he ſay, "MONSEIGNEUR," the true French tranſlation for MY LORD, his meaning would ſoon ceaſe to be a ſtate ſecret. Foreign Nobles would no longer *mylord* the Engliſh; and *Sir*, being the complimentary addreſs of the Britiſh Lords when they ſpeak to foreigners, the Britiſh Lords would receive no other from the Lords of any nation.

The conſequences, reſulting from the improper application of the words MY LORD, are of the greateſt magnitude, when our political ſituation is conſidered by ſenſible patriots. They are too important to admit of a partial, or ſlow reformation. Malevolence ſhould not have the leaſt pretence for aſcribing that rational and indiſpenſable meaſure to a pedantic affectation of republican rigoriſm. It ought not to be repreſented as a ſally of petulance or reſentment.

The dignity of our confederation demands that the degrading phraſes ſhould be reprobated by a ſolemn act. Under the penalty of infamy, the uſe of them ſhould be prohibited amongſt us, within our territories, as well as in foreign parts, when acting in a public or private character: Addreſſes to Lords of all countries ſhould be included within the prohibition: The principle on which that act ſhall be framed, will, doubtleſs, be explained in that nervous, but diſpaſſionate ſtyle—with that truth and noble ſimplicity, which diſtinguiſh the moſt important reſolutions of Congreſs; but THIS ought to be tranſlated into every European language, and ſent with all poſſible deſpatch wherever our Miniſters have any acceſs.

They correſpond with the grandees of France and Spain, upon the terms of equality which are due to our recognized independence, and their ſtyle has till now declared thoſe of Britain to be *their* Lords! If the Preſident of our Congreſs, our Commiſſioners, Generals and Plenipotentiaries comply much longer with abuſive cuſtoms, which our knowledge of the Engliſh language bids us to aboliſh, what can theſe Lords think of the contraſt which our ſervility and reſiſtance hold up to their view? do we mean to balance their hopes and fears, to protract the war—to juſtify them in believing that ſome time or other they will once more be OUR Lords?

It is not intended here to inſinuate, that we ſhould not indulge foreigners of diſtinction with certain complimentary forms, uſually allowed to them; but thoſe forms, to be lawful, muſt not imply the denial of our Independence, the inferiority of the United States, nor the perſonal degradation of the individuals of our confederation, who comply with ſuch cuſtoms.

Lord, or *Lords*, are very harmleſs words in themſelves, and may be as innocently uſed *ſingly*, as *Sir* now is, in converſation or writing. If the addreſſer would be more particular in his diſtinction of titles, he might extend that form to thoſe of Princes, Dukes, &c. and obſerve the ſame rules with ladies. The addreſs might begin, and not inelegantly, with the words "Prince, Princeſs, Duke, Dutcheſs," &c. the compliments of *Highneſs*, *Excellency*, or the words of diſtinction peculiar to the rank of the addreſſed perſons, might be occaſionally connected in the uſual manner.—But the word MY, which ſometimes renders the phraſe treaſonable, ſometimes blaſphemous, and always degrading, ought to be *moſt religiouſly* omitted. The eye, as well as the ear, will ſoon be pleaſed with ſuch rational innovations, juſt as they have long ſince been, with theſe words of addreſs, *General*, *Colonel*, *Captain*, *Doctor*, &c.

Should the words, propoſed to be *ſingly* uſed, ſound unmelodiouſly on account of their brevity, before the ear is accuſtomed to the new forms, the title, or the office enjoyed by the addreſſed perſon might be added with eaſe. "*Lord Duke*, *Lord Earl*, *Lord Viſcount*, *Lord Chancellor*, "*Lord Juſtice*, *Lord Mayor*," &c. would not grate the niceſt ear. The new mode of addreſs may be adapted to any other title or name of office, which now is or may hereafter be known. The alterations will be found very convenient in converſation or writing. They are perfectly inoffenſive to the moſt ſcrupulous republican, as well as to the proudeſt potentate; and, for this reaſon, our example will infallibly be imitated by all foreign States. When the indecency of the reprobated cuſtoms is pointed out by Congreſs, and its moral and political conſequences are impartially weighed by our late brethen, the Britons, it will juſtly alarm their jealouſy. The Britiſh commoners will probably be our firſt imitators.

It cannot be diſowned that all phraſes, requiring the uſe of the third, inſtead of the ſecond perſon, are attended with ſome impropriety. It is cenſured indeed, but ſubmitted to, by reaſonable criticks. They wiſh that independent men ſhould neither be, nor appear afraid of addreſſing, in a direct manner, the perſon to whom they ſpeak or write. To ſay, "I have received your Excellency's orders," inſtead of "I have received your orders," is a phraſeology condemned, though complied with, by them. They ſcarcely would tolerate it at the firſt moment of a ſolemn viſit, at the opening of public meetings, or at the concluſion of letters. They admit its propriety no where, but in the titles of memorials, and the ſuperſcriptions of letters, the addreſs not being of a *direct* nature in ſuch like caſes.

The demand, claim, propoſal, requeſt or prayer, contained in the applications known under the names of petitions or memorials, ſhould be *entirely* in the firſt perſon, and *vocatively* introduced, as in *allocutive* addreſſes, by the words "Excellent Sir," or "Excellent Lord," if the addreſſed be a Lord, and entitled to the compliment of *Excellency*. It is really painful to recollect that Lords *Howe*, *Carliſle*, *Stormont*, &c. have been addreſſed otherwiſe, in converſation or writing. The elegance of this form will be generally acknowledged. As to the uncouth, circumlocutory traſh, with which the moſt ſenſible men have been, by the tyranny of cuſtom, compelled to ſtuff their memorials, we ought to relinquiſh it to its inventors, the degenerate Britons: Let them excluſively enjoy their "May it pleaſe your Excellency, your Honour, or Lordſhip," "Your memorialiſt having," &c. "Your petitioner, as in duty bound, ever ſhall pray," &c. The diſſonance of ſuch diſmal ditties is intolerable to a republican ear. But, "May it pleaſe your Excellency" is a phraſe ſuperlatively fooliſh; for it proclaims a diſreſpect which is not meant. Under the appearance of a wiſh, it betrays the addreſſer's dread of a capricious anſwer! Why ſhould we labour to appear falſe, when we mean to declare the truth, and moſt earneſtly wiſh to be believed?

It is true that the too frequent repetition of *Excellency* is far from being judged excellent in compoſition. It ſometimes indicates ſycophantry, in perſons who have not been quite unconverſant with the world; but the irregularity of ſuch phraſes, as well as the miſapplication of YOU for THOU, will be with greater propriety examined by our academical patriots, *within* their academical ſphere. It is their duty, no doubt, to diſplay their abilities, to exerciſe the genius of their pupils, and exert their united endeavours, for gradually correcting, *with diſcretion*, all the imperfections of language. Let it reſt there.—Our Delegates, in that auguſt character, cannot deſcend to debate upon imperfections, which do not tend to render our Independence doubtful, to deprave the morals, or leſſen the perſonal dignity of any member of our Confederation. Such diſquiſitions are incompatible with the majeſty of Congreſs. But our Delegates may, with dignity, recommend or preſcribe the modes of addreſs to be uſed, when application is made to their body IN CONGRESS. It would be treaſonable in *a man of knowledge* to give them the attributes of ſovereignty. They have, each of them, as individuals, no more than their ſhare in our fœderal ſovereignty. At the ſame time, they are the lawful Repreſentatives of its executive authority,—they are PRINCES, when acting *collectively* IN CONGRESS; there, they ought to be treated as our *lawful* PRINCES, but not elſewhere. The Preſident might very juſtly be ſtyled PRINCE OF CONGRESS, during his Preſidency, as the Preſident of the Roman Senate was, the PRINCE of the Senate.

A Briton may ridicule this title given to our Delegates, and ſcornfully exclaiming, ſay "Princes! of what? of "the United States of America? do you pretend that "you are the United States of America? that you are

" the Sovereigns of the Engliſh, French, Dutch, and " Daniſh Iſlands in the Weſt-Indies---of the Spaniſh and " Portugueſe Empires on this Continent—of the Indian " Nations, the names of which are not even known to " you? Are all thoſe territories parts of your United " States? When did their inhabitants accede to your " union? Do you mean that the whole continent of Ame- " rica belongs to you?— Are you not afraid that your " Allies will ſcrutinize your falſe ſtyle, and ſuſpect your " ambitious deſigns?"

We ſhall not attempt to palliate errors, but frankly confeſs them. Inadvertency, not ambition, was the cauſe; and a reformation may be juſtly expected from a virtuous people. But the new ſtyle of our confederation is a very important meaſure.

The territories in our poſſeſſion, being but a part of the Continent which was made known to Europe by Columbus, our national name cannot with propriety be taken from him, on account of his diſcovery, any more than from Americ Veſpuce. The merit of the diſcovery has nothing moral in it, nothing which could juſtify our naming ourſelves after him. The trifling injuſtice done his memory, by the European Geographers, does not deſerve our national attention.

Fifteen years have elapſed ſince the firſt defenders of our liberties began to diſtinguiſh themſelves by the ominous appellation of SONS OF LIBERTY, or SONS OF FREEDOM. If we diſtinguiſh ourſelves by a name expreſſing the noble ſituation we are bleſſed with, and conſtantly impreſſing our minds with the moral duties of that ſtate, it would be a much fitter name for us, as a *national* diſtinction, than that of any dead or living man. Inſtead of adopting the vague, and circumlocutory ſtyle of the *Seven United Provinces*, had the confederates of the Netherlands diſtinguiſhed themſelves by a *national* name, common to them all, they would have been more united; the Provinces which ſubmitted again to the Auſtrian bondage might have remained inviolably attached to the Confederation. The Hollanders are ſtrongly attached to thoſe of their own Province; but they are *not* to their brethren of Zutphen, or Zeeland, who are not comprehended with them, under one common name, as the *Switzers* are, tho' ſeparate into Thirteen Cantons, independent from each other.

FREELAND might be adopted by us, for an *allegorical* name. THE FREELANDERS; THE FREELANDIC *Soldiers, Merchants or Academies*; THE FREELANDIC *Territories, Delegates and* PRINCES; *The Army, Navy and Trade*; THE STATES, or CONFEDERATION OF FREELAND, are expreſſive, noble, and well-ſounding words. Any perſon, acquainted with the Engliſh language, readily underſtands their full meaning. *Eleutheria*, which is a Greek equivalent to *Freeland*, never could ſo powerfully affect thoſe who do not underſtand that language, even after a proper explanation. *Freeland* and its derivatives are excellent *by-words*, and may prove very convenient, on many occaſions, as *by-words*. But a NATIONAL name muſt not be propoſed by an obſcure individual. It ought to come *firſt* from Congreſs; and we juſtly expect from them all the advantages deriving from that indiſpenſable meaſure.

This ſubject naturally leads the mind to a review of the American titles of diſtinction—to conſider, whether or not, they be badges of our former ſlavery, and whether good ſenſe and policy urge us to retain or aboliſh them.

Hereditary titles of Britiſh Peerage diſtinguiſh no family, in the countries formerly known on the northern part of this continent, under the name of BRITISH COLONIES. Of thoſe which have already acceded, as well as the others, all which will infallibly, and very ſoon, accede to our republican ſyſtem of union, not one is contaminate by excluſive, hereditary titles of nobility. This is a ſpecial bleſſing! Neither the Corſicans, nor ſo many other oppreſſed nations before them, would have failed in their generous attempts for recovering their liberties, had they not been ſecretly counteracted, and at laſt betrayed—ruined by their *Nobles*, although moſt of them had ſincerely, at firſt, eſpouſed their juſt cauſe. The Switzers, and afterwards the Dutch, who, at different periods, ſhook off the yoke of the Houſe of Auſtria, were not ſo happily circumſtanced in that reſpect as we are. Had they been ſo peculiarly bleſſed, their ſtruggles for the recovery of their natural rights would have been much ſooner rewarded than they have been, with the clear and general recognition of their Independence. Since they have obtained that advantage, the few Nobles who continued with them have conſtantly oppoſed the eſtabliſhment of a ſound conſtitution, for the want of which no free State ought to expect permanency. The deſcendants of the Nobles are, to this day, a cancer which ſecretly corrodes the vitals of thoſe two federal republicks. That of the Dutch ſcarcely deſerves the name at this time. In moſt of the Swiſs cantons, the country inhabitants are vaſſals to the body of the *Burghers*. They have not the rights of CITIZENS, unleſs they be likewiſe admitted into the order of the *Burghers*; and but few of them are. A feudal tyranny is exerciſed over the diſtricts, ſubjected to moſt of the cantons. Theſe vaſſals of a free people muſt have truer notions of the deſcription of hell, than thoſe which are conceived by ſuch who never had the misfortune of experiencing ſimilar feelings.

Our enemies cannot deſtroy our union by the inſtitution of excluſive, hereditary diſtinctions, in any of our States. They cannot have *nobles* for their emiſſaries.

About five or ſix of the American inhabitants have been, of late years, rather diſgraced than honoured by the crown of Britain. The zeal which they have manifeſted againſt their own, as well as our rights, has been recompenſed with a vain hereditary title; but theſe *Titulars* are no part of the Britiſh nobility. They have been, as the ſacrilegious audaciouſneſs of the Britiſh Chancery ſtyles it, CREATED Baronets; and, what have they gained by being thus diſtinguiſhed? Moſt of them, if not all, have been reduced to ſeek for an aſylum with the enemy. There, inſtead of the wealth coveted by their avidity, they are deſervedly puniſhed with poverty.

The ſubaltern, diminutive, and conſequently ridiculous, title of *Baronet*, was invented by James the Firſt, and ſold by him to vain Commoners, that the profits of the ſale might enable him, together with other diſhonourable contrivances, to become independent of his Parliament for legal ſupplies, and govern as a deſpot. No *legiſlatorial* vote being the appendage of that title, the perſonal conſequence of the poſſeſſor is not otherwiſe raiſed, than by a trifling precedency over *moſt* other Commoners. And yet, ſuch is the exceſſive vanity of the Britiſh nation, that, unſubſtantial as that prerogative is, it operates as an irreſiſtible inchantment on many of them. From *James the Firſt* to *George the Third*, numbers of men, who had been once idolized as incorruptible patriots, have been metamorphoſed by it into ſervile courtiers. It proves that Britons do not poſſeſs more intrinſic virtue than their neighbours; that they are equally "prone to the vices of the worſt of men, and the foibles of little minds"—that the too credulous encomiaſts of that SELF-ADULATING nation deſerve no credit.

The voluntary ſacrifice of that inſignificant, though obnoxious title, would have been greatly honoured, and accepted as *noble* and *meritorious*, had it been *ſpontaneouſly* offered upon patriotic principles, by the American poſſeſſors; but not one of theſe ſubaltern dignitaries has yet had ſufficient virtue or policy to abjure it! Their obſtinate attachment to this ſhadow of nobility ought to be an inſtructive leſſon to us. Had we been curſed with a body of nobles, we would have been already betrayed into "unconditional ſubmiſſion."

A recommendation of Congreſs will, at pleaſure, quench the inordinate thirſt for titles, which a few vain individuals are ſuſpected to be tormented with, in our infant republicks. It may be effected, by recommending the truly deſcriptive and conſtitutional title of LORD to be ſubſtituted for the falſe, equivocal name of MASTER, uſually prefixed to every man's name. In the ſame manner, the title of LADY may be prefixed to every woman's name, inſtead of the uncertain name of MISTRESS, which has ſtill more *doubtful* ſignifications than *Maſter*. The *dubbed* Knights, and their ſuperiors the BARONETS, if any of them remain or be permitted to return amongſt us, will receive from this ſimple recommendation a higher, and certainly more honourable promotion. They will enjoy more ſubſtantial prerogatives than they could reaſonably have expected from their late CREATOR. The *Baronetcies* conferred upon Americans will be extinguiſhed, and held by the incumbents themſelves in the ſame contempt that they are by others; or, their non-acceptance of the Joint-Lordſhip, which they would be entitled to, if qualified Members of our FEDERAL PEERAGE, will proclaim them *enemies*.

As to the additions of RIGHT, or MOST HONOURABLE, they may be taken in or left out of all inſtruments and writings, in which verboſity and tautology are not imputed as ſins againſt elegance; but they never will appear in proceedings at law, drawn by judicious practitioners. No ſenſible man or woman, of any denomination, will ever uſe that ſtyle; and others will be deterred from it, by the fear of being objects of ridicule. Nor will any "Lordſhip" or "Ladyſhip" be heard or read in polite converſation or correſpondence; cringing, low dependents themſelves will avoid theſe phraſes. HONOUR will no more come out of our lips or pens on *complimentary* occaſions; and it is hoped it will render it more reſpectable, and fix it in our hearts.

The title of ESQUIRE will be conſequently obliterated, as well as *complimentary* HONOUR, by the more honourable deſcription of LORD. *Eſquire*, in Latin *Armiger*, ſignifies *One who bears arms*, or *A Warrior*; it likewiſe ſignifies an *Armour-Bearer*. This diſtinction was beſtowed, in the barbarous ages of feudal tyranny, upon every warrior, when he firſt went to war; but no others were then allowed that honour beſides the owners, or the deſcendants of the owners of manors. All theſe were inſolently ſtyled by themſelves, *The Men of Family*, or *Gentlemen*, from the Latin word *gens*, in Engliſh, *a race, a family*, or *a nation*; and their body was termed *the Gentry*, that is, in their own conceit of their ſuperior nature, *They who had been born!* It was proper enough in fact; for the *Gentry* conſidered the reſt of the nation as brutes, and treated them as "two legged beaſts."

Theſe *Eſquires*, who always fought on horſeback, formed the feudal armies, which, in all the ſtates of Europe, wholly conſiſted of ſuch cavalry. The Eſquires were candidates for the Knighthood, the higheſt military honour of thoſe times. Some of them, in the character of *Armour-Bearers*, ſerved under a Knight, who, being an eye witneſs to the warlike atchievements of his Eſquire, could vouch for him, and after ſufficient trials, recommend him for the honours of the Knighthood. The Eſquire became a Knight, that is, *A Horſeman*, by way of eminence. But, beſides his acknowledged merit, he muſt have had the good fortune of poſſeſſing a manor, of ſufficient wealth for bringing into the field, and maintaining at his own expence, the fixed number of thoſe Warriors, or *Horſemen*, or *Eſquires*, required for ſuch qualification. This is the true origin of the miſapplied title of *Eſquire*, which a happy change of manners now renders ſo unmeaning, and often ſo ridiculous in *Great-Britain*.

[*Turn to the Fourth Page.*]

For the PENNSYLVANIA GAZETTE.

OBSERVATIONS on the PAROLES exacted by the Britiſh *in the State of South-Carolina.*

Quod genus hoc hominum!

HOW is it that nothing will be ſacred with our enemies, and that conventions the moſt inviolable amongſt men, they will reſpect or deſpiſe according to their caprice and their intereſt for the moment. The Britiſh, in their expedition in Carolina, have cauſed the inhabitants and the militia to ſign paroles of honour, of the following tenor.

"*I do hereby acknowledge myſelf to be a priſoner of war upon my parole to his Excellency Sir Henry Clinton, and that I am thereby engaged, until I ſhall be exchanged or otherwiſe releaſed therefrom, to remain in , and that I ſhall not in the mean time do, or cauſe any thing to be done, prejudicial to the ſucceſs of his Majeſty's arms, or have intercourſe or have correſpondence with his enemies; and that upon a ſummons from his Excellency, or other perſon having authority thereto, that I will ſurrender myſelf to him or them, at ſuch time and place as I ſhall hereafter be required.*"

I do not examine by what right theſe paroles have been exacted from citizens who had not taken arms, and who, peaceable inhabitants of their farms, waited the iſſue of the war. We know that this practice is contrary to the uſage of civilized nations, and theſe paroles are a new invention of the Britiſh law of nations, different in all reſpects from that of the law of other nations. With regard to the militia, it is clear that this writing is a reciprocal engagement, in which the priſoner promiſes to remain in quietneſs under the tacit condition that his enemy will not diſturb him in any manner, and will permit him the free exerciſe of all his rights as an individual, with exception to that of *taking up arms, or ſupporting in any manner the cauſe for which he fought when he was taken.* This expedient has been thought of, whether in favour of the priſoner to whom it procures ſome of the advantages of liberty; or in favour of the conqueror who finds himſelf by that means leſs incumbered in his expeditions, and who, on the principle of the ſentiments of honour of his priſoner, is delivered from the dangerous care of guarding him, and the obligation of providing for his ſupport. It is then clear that this engagement is reciprocal, ſeeing the advantages are ſo; otherwiſe the priſoner would refuſe ſubſcribing it, and depriving himſelf of the expectation of recovering his liberty, whether by a fortunate eſcape, or by the aſſiſtance of thoſe who contend for the ſame cauſe with himſelf. This act is then of the nature of contracts, which cannot be diſſolved but by the conſent of the two parties, or the infidelity of one freeing the other from the engagements which he has taken.

What name ſhall we then give to the conduct of the General, who, of his own authority, deprives, without the concurrence and the conſent of the priſoner, or without his having forfeited in any manner his parole, iſſues out the following proclamation.

"*Whereas, after the arrival of his Majeſty's forces under my command in this province in February laſt, numbers of perſons voluntarily ſurrendered themſelves or were made priſoners by his Majeſty's forces, and were afterwards diſmiſſed upon their reſpective paroles. And whereas, ſince the ſurrender of Charleſtown and the defeat and diſperſion of the rebel forces, it is become unneceſſary that ſuch paroles ſhould be any longer obſerved, and it is fit and proper that all perſons ſhould take an active part in ſettling and ſecuring his Majeſty's government, and delivering the country from the anarchy which for ſome time paſt has prevailed. I do therefore iſſue this my proclamation, to declare that all the inhabitants of this Province, who are now priſoners upon parole and were not in a military line, thoſe who were in Charleſtown and Fort Moultrie at the time of their capitulation and ſurrender, and were then in actual confinement, excepted, that from and after the twentieth day of June inſtant, they are freed and exempted from all ſuch paroles, and may hold themſelves as reſtored to all the rights and duties belonging to citizens and inhabitants; and all perſons under the deſcription before-mentioned, who ſhall afterwards neglect to return to their allegiance, due to his Majeſty's government, will be conſidered as enemies and rebels to the ſame, and treated accordingly.*

June 3, 1780. *H. CLINTON.*"

How! It has become uſeleſs ſince the reduction of Charlestown to obſerve any longer theſe paroles! Is it not clear by the very date of the greater part of theſe engagements that they have been contracted ſince *the reduction of that place.* It is then abſurd to pretend that they are from that time uſeleſs to be obſerved. It is as if Gen Clinton would ſay, "Whereas we have promiſed to the Carolinians to ſuffer them to go freely on their paroles, provided they will ſurrender the capital city of their State: Now that we have this city in our poſſeſſion, and that we have reaped all the advantage of the promiſe that we made to them, we will annul it, and we will mean to impoſe upon them whatever laws we ſhall think proper." Is it poſſible to ſport with oaths ſo lightly, and who will believe that a ſolemn contract can be coolly annulled by this ſtrange aſſertion, "It is become unneceſſary that ſuch paroles ſhould be any longer obſerved, &c.

We muſt revolt, without doubt, againſt ſuch procedure. But what ſhall be the indignation of thoſe who will compare this Proclamation with the article of the Capitulation of Charleſtown, ſigned H. Clinton:

"Art. IV. *The militia now in garriſon ſhall be permitted to return to their reſpective homes as priſoners upon parole*; which parole, ſo long as they obſerve, ſhall ſecure them from being moleſted in their property by the Britiſh troops."

This ſame article is violated by the Britiſh, who extend the effects of the Proclamation to the militia taken in Charleſtown, though this Proclamation has not dared to make mention of it, as if the Britiſh were more aſhamed to command a perfidy than to commit it. Will they ſay that they will reſpect the rights of the militia, and that they will exact of them only military ſervice. It is a new outrage greater than all the others. What right is more dear to an individual than that of perſonal liberty, than the uſe of arms, of inclination, and what abuſe more intolerable than that of being obliged to turn them againſt his country. But the Britiſh will ſee this violation of the Capitulation to fall upon themſelves, and if there are citizens ſo depraved as to arm themſelves againſt their countrymen, all others diſcharged from this moment from an engagement which the Britiſh have violated with ſo little ſhame, will take up arms to unite themſelves to the defenders of the honourable cauſe of liberty, and to revenge themſelves for the contempt with which they have been treated by the enemy.

In effect, what part can we take againſt a nation with whom nothing is ſacred? our houſes cannot be an aſylum againſt their treachery; there they carry their burnings; our women, our children are there the unhappy victims of their barbarity; they arm our ſlaves againſt us. Even our churches are not ſafe from their incendiary torches. Shall we cover ourſelves in the ramparts of our cities? overpowered with numbers, if we conſent to a capitulation, the articles are violated as ſoon as they are ſigned. Shall we fly amongſt the ſavages of America? Our enemies have armed them againſt us: They have recourſe with joy to this reſource which we had diſdained. The Mohawk is become the aſſociate of the Britiſh army, and the wickedneſs of the one is encreaſed by that of the other; as different poiſons become doubly deſtructive when they are compounded together. How then ſhall we guard ourſelves from the perfidy of this degenerate nation? It is by attacking them in open field of battle; it is by going to ſeek their mercenaries in the fortreſſes where they are ſhut up; it is by not ſhewing ourſelves to them, but with arms in our hands; it is thus that courage may diſconcert treachery, and it is thus that it behoves an American, fighting for his liberty, to ſhew himſelf to a Briton armed for the purpoſe of enſlaving him.

Philadelphia, July 20, 1780.

ALL perſons who have any demands upon the eſtate of JOHN LABOYTEAUX, deceaſed, late of this city, merchant; and all thoſe that are indebted, are deſired to bring in their accounts to the ſubſcriber, near the Drawbridge, Water-ſtreet, that they may be ſettled.

HANNAH LABOYTEAUX, Adminiſtratrix.

N. B. A pair of elegant LOOKING-GLASSES, and ſome large PICTURES, to be ſold at the above place. †

WRAPPING PAPER,
To be SOLD, by
HALL & SELLERS.

LONDON, *April* 8.

Advices are received from Holland, that a body of French troops, to the amount of 20,000 men, are on their march along the Flemiſh coaſt, where they are going to take up their ſtation, and that this has cauſed no ſmall alarm in the Dutch dominions.

We are aſſured from Peterſburg, of the 3d ult. notwithſtanding what has been aſſerted to the contrary, that the Court of Ruſſia will not depart from the reſolution ſhe has taken of obſerving a ſtrict neutrality during the war; and that the Ruſſians are now equipping, with the utmoſt diſpatch, 15 ſhips of the line, and ſix frigates, to put to ſea as ſoon as poſſible, for the protection of the trade and navigation of that empire

Extract of a letter from Cork, March 20.

"We are ſorry to hear that the Penelope frigate, Capt. Jones, after having taken ſome Spaniſh prizes, was herſelf taken by the Spaniards, in the following manner:—A ſudden wind ariſing, many of the Penelope's hands were upon the yards, taking in the ſails; which opportunity the Spaniſh priſoners embraced, and having killed Capt. Jones, with moſt of his officers, they overcame the remaining crew, and carried the ſhip into Cuba."

April 11. Commodore Walſingham has at length ſailed; his deſtination, with that of Admiral Greaves, is uncertain. The ſquadron of the latter is ſaid by ſome to conſiſt of 6 ſhips, others of 9, and that they are both to join in a certain latitude, and after leaving their convoy in ſafety are to return to form a fleet of obſervation in our ſeas, and to join thoſe ſhips which are to compoſe the channel fleet, in order to prevent a junction of the combined fleets. It is probable that we ſhall be able ſhortly to give a more ſatisfactory account of the force and deſtination of the ſquadron of Admiral Greaves. In general, for ſome days paſt, the news-papers abound with ſpeculation. The laſt accounts via Holland, have ſo ſtrangely altered the ſyſtem which they ſo induſtriouſly propagated for truth, that their fertile geniuſes are exhauſted. They read and read again the declaration and memorial of the Court of Ruſſia, which ſeems to tell the Hollanders, "*Join with us, and they ſhall no longer ſearch your veſſels, nor ſeize your merchandize.*" They not only find in that declaration nothing that confirms the account ſo often given of powerful ſuccours to be granted by Ruſſia, but it ſhews us that this ſame Ruſſia, in obliging all the maritime powers to a ſtrict neutrality, which cannot but be diſadvantageous to us, is alſo leaving us tyed hand and foot to the dangerous confederation of three powerful enemies, and gives us to underſtand that the wiſh of Europe in general, and of that Court in particular, is that we ſhould make peace immediately. If they are obliged to give ſuch an interpretation to a ſtep of this kind, what inference can we draw, but that the independence of America, ſecretly acknowledged by every other Court in Europe, muſt ſoon be by that of St. James's?—After having ſuffered the diſtreſſes of a war, and drained of our reſources, we ſhall think ourſelves happy, after all our grandeur, to be ranked at the concluſion of a peace amongſt the independent nations.

BARBADOS, *June* 10.

On Tueſday laſt arrived an expreſs from St. Lucia to Admiral Rodney, ſhe informs that the French fleet had refitted and at ſea. Same day arrived the Cyclops frigate, from a cruiſe: ſhe gave an account of ſeeing a very large fleet, ſuppoſed to be Spaniards: on this information the Admiral got under weigh with 18 ſail of the line, and immediately proceeded in queſt of them.

RICHMOND *(in Virginia,) July* 12.

By a letter from Hillſborough, dated July 1, we are informed the enemy have not been higher up the country than the Wax Saws; they have retreated to Cambden, and are entrenching themſelves. The militia of North Carolina turn out almoſt to a man, they have 4000 men at Croſs creek, and as many more ready at a minute's warning. The Maryland line, Harriſon's artillery, and Virginia troops, with militia, will make 5000 more. General Rutherford routed a ſtrong party of tories near Catawba, and has killed ſixty of them, and taken three hundred priſoners.

BALTIMORE, *July* 18.

Extract of a letter from St. Euſtatia, dated the 26th ult.

"The combined fleets of France and Spain, ſaid to conſiſt of 36 ſhips of the Line, have lately left Martinico, with a number of tranſports; but whither deſtined is not known. This armament, however, makes them quake in the Engliſh Iſlands."

Report ſays, that the French and Spaniſh forces lately landed on St. Lucia, amount to 15,000 effective men.

The ſchooner——, Capt. Caulfield, of this port, inward bound from Hiſpaniola, was chaſed aſhore by the enemy, a few days ago, near Cape-Henry, where veſſel and cargo were entirely loſt.

CHATHAM, July 19.

On Sunday laſt three of the enemy's dragoons ſwam their horſes, with their accoutrements, from Staten-Iſland; and came over to our people at Elizabeth Town.

We are informed that the ſpirit of deſertion is very prevalent among the enemy, no leſs than fifteen of their light horſe men deſerted in a body on the 6th inſtant, with their horſes, arms, and accoutrements; ſix of them came into Frederickſburg, and nine to General Howe's headquarters; and that ſcarcely a day elapſes without more or leſs coming off to ſome of our poſts on the Eaſt ſide of Hudſon's river.

Night before laſt five or ſix of the refugees came over to Newark and carried off Major Hayes, Juſtice Canfield and ſon, and Zophar Lyon.

Extract of a letter from an officer at Weſt Point, to his friend at Morriſtown, dated July 5.

"Captain Sacket, with a ſmall party, was ſent on a ſcout towards the White Plains, where he fell in with a party of his Britannic Majeſty's cow thieves, killed eleven, and took fifteen priſoners, and near four hundred head of cattle, moſtly fat, all which he brought to Fiſh-Kill."

Extract of a letter from the Continental Village, July 2.

—"The enemy lie in the following order—Their centre are encamped on Valentine's Hill, their left on Philip's Hill, their right near Stephen Ward's, Eaſt-Cheſter; the Britiſh grenadiers on the right, and the Heſſians on the left; the light infantry advanced half a mile in front: Their ſick and wounded removed out of the hoſpitals into the country."

PHILADELPHIA, *July* 26.

Extract of a letter from Paris, March 3, 1780.

"We are hourly in expectation of great news from Holland, Ireland, England and Spain, but above all from America and the Weſt-Indies. By the Engliſh papers you will perceive the violent fermentation in England, which has ariſen to ſuch an height, as to produce a Congreſs in fact, and it will ſoon be ſo in name. The proceedings in the Houſe of Commons on the fourteenth, which were terminated by a reſolution of the Committee of the whole Houſe, to aboliſh the Board of trade and plantations, carried againſt the Miniſtry after a very long and warm debate by a majority of eight voices, is not only the moſt extraordinary vote which has paſſed in the preſent reign, but it leads to very extenſive conſequences.

"I believe it is very true, that this Board has been the true cauſe of the quarrel of Great-Britain againſt the Colonies, and therefore may be conſidered as a natural object of national reſentment; but a reſentment of this kind alone, would not probably have produced this effect.

"Whether it is the near approach of an election, that has intimidated the Members of the Houſe of Commons; or whether the Committees, petitions, aſſociations and Congreſs, have alarmed them; or whether the nation is convinced that America is indeed loſt forever, and conſequently, that the Board will in future be uſeleſs, I don't know.

"Be this as it may, the Engliſh nation, and even the Iriſh and Scotch nations, all parts of the world, will draw this inference from it, that even in the opinion of the Houſe of Commons, America is loſt. The free and virtuous citizens of America, and even the ſlaviſh and vicious, if there are any ſtill remaining of this character, under the denomination of tories, muſt be convinced by this vote, paſſed in the Hey-day of their joy for the ſucceſſes of Admiral Rodney's fleet, that the Houſe of Commons deſpair of ever regaining America. The nations ſubject to the Houſe of Bourbon, cannot fail to put the ſame interpretation upon this tranſaction. Holland, and all the northern powers, with the Empreſs of Ruſſia at their head, who are all greatly irritated againſt England, for their late violences againſt the innocent commerce of neutral powers, will draw the ſame conſequences.

"The politicians of Great-Britain are too enlightened in the hiſtory of nations, and the riſe and progreſs of cauſes and effects in the political world, not to ſee that all theſe bodies of people will, in conſequence of this vote, conſider the Colonies as given up for loſt by the Houſe of Commons; and they are too well inſtructed not to know the important conſequences that follow, from having ſuch points as theſe, thus ſettled among the nations. I cannot therefore but conſider this vote, and the other reſpecting the Secretary of State for the American department, which aroſe almoſt to a balance, as a moſt important declaration of the ſenſe of the nation.

"The firſt probable conſequence of it will be one further attempt, by offering ſome ſpecious terms, which they know we cannot in juſtice, in honour, in conſcience, accept, to deceive, ſeduce and divide America, throw all into confuſion there, and by this means gaining an opportunity to govern.

"There is nothing more aſtoniſhing than the inconſiſtencies of the patriots in England. Thoſe, who are moſt violent againſt the Miniſtry, are not for making peace with France and Spain; but they wiſh to allure America into a ſeparate peace, and perſuade her to join them againſt the Houſe of Bourbon. One would think it impoſſible, that one man of ſenſe in the world could ſeriouſly believe, that we could thus baſely violate our faith, thus unreaſonably quarrel with our beſt friends, thus madly attach ourſelves to our bittereſt enemies. But thus it is."

The French fleet arrived at Rhode-Iſland the 12th inſt. in exceeding good order, amounting to 8 ſhips of the line. The French troops are animated with the greateſt pleaſure on opening the expedition on which they have been ſent by our illuſtrious Ally. They ſhew the greateſt ſatisfaction at the manner in which they were received by the inhabitants of Newport, and manifeſt an extreme ardor, and the greateſt anxiety to join in the operations againſt the common enemy. The French ſoldiery have been made acquainted with the extraordinary exertions now making throughout the United States, to render the campaign effectual and glorious, and this has redoubled the ardor with which they were before inſpired, it is hinted, that in addition to the many proofs which we have already had of the friendſhip of his Moſt Chriſtian Majeſty for the Thirteen United States, a further evidence thereof will ſoon be given.

The firſt Nobles of the kingdom of France have ſolicited as a mark of diſtinguiſhed favor the honour of coming over to fight on this Continent. M. the Count De Rochambeau commands the French troops, and he has with him, under the direction of General Waſhington, M. Le Chevalier de Ternay, formerly Governor of the Iſle of France, who commands the French ſquadron.

The whole fleet is arrived, except one tranſport with 350 men on board, which ſeparated from the ſquadron 4 days before their arrival. She is expected daily.

They have taken ſeveral prizes, amongſt them is the veſſel with diſpatches for England, with the account of the ſurrender of Charleſtown.

In COUNCIL, *Philadelphia, July* 24, 1780.

WHEREAS a generous Subſcription hath been entered into by the inhabitants of this city, for the purpoſe of raiſing recruits to fill the Pennſylvania line: WE do hereby declare, that a Bounty of Three Half Johanneſſes, a compleat Suit of Cloaths, and Two Hundred Acres of Land, will be given to every able bodied man, not under 18, nor above 45 years of age (except deſerters, priſoners of war of every kind, or ſeamen) who will voluntary enliſt to ſerve during the war. All Lieutenants, Sub-Lieutenants, and Officers of the Militia, and other well diſpoſed perſons, are hereby requeſted to uſe their utmoſt influence in their ſeveral diſtricts, to encourage and promote the deſign aforeſaid, and ſhall for their trouble in ſo doing, receive Two Hundred Dollars for every recruit that ſhall paſs muſter, if delivered to Col nel Nicola, at the Barracks, in this city, who will alſo pay the bounty.

And as it is probable that there are many deſerters from the Pennſylvania line lurking about in this city, and in divers parts of the country, any perſons therefore who will apprehend ſuch deſerters, ſhall, upon delivering them at the Barracks to Col. Nicola, receive One Half Johannes, or the exchange, at ſixty, in Continental money, together with all reaſonable charges.

Extract from the Minutes,

T. MATLACK, Secretary.

†‡† In the firſt Column of the Fourth Page, 15 lines from the bottom, after the word *reſpect*, the reader is deſired to add *amongſt the French, as "Monſeigneur," in Engliſh*, My Lord, is, &c. the omiſſion not being diſcovered till after the firſt ſide was ſtruck off.

GEORGE BRINGHURST, *Coach-maker*,

FROM GERMANTOWN,

HAS erected a large and commodious SHOP in Fourth-ſtreet, between Arch and Race-ſtreets, oppoſite the new Lutheran Church, where he makes and repairs all kinds of CARRIAGES, in the neateſt and beſt manner.

Gentlemen, who chooſe to favour him with their orders from the neighbouring ſtates, may depend on having particular attention paid.

He has for SALE, a neat ſecond-hand SULKEY, and ſeveral other Carriages.

WANTED, JOURNEYMEN COACH-MAKERS, ſuch as Body and Carriage-makers; and a good Wheeler will meet with encouragement.

July 25, 1780.

Warminſter townſhip, Bucks county, July 20.

THIS is to forewarn all perſons againſt taking any Aſſignment on a NOTE from GEORGE SNELING againſt me, bearing date, June the 22d, 1780, for the ſum of *Seven Hundred and Fifty Pounds*; as the ſame is a fraud, I do refuſe payment, without compelled by law.

JOSEPH HART.

Five Hundred Dollars Reward,

WILL be given for apprehending the perſon or perſons, who, on the night of the 24th of June laſt, broke into the dwelling-houſe of the ſubſcriber, on the iſland of Tinicum, and ſtole the following ARTICLES, viz. Three table-cloths, two huckaback and one plain, five coarſe ſhirts, pretty much worn, three pair of coarſe trowſers, much worn, two ſhifts, one almoſt new, the other a good deal worn, one old check apron, one white linen ditto, one flowered muſlin ditto, marked FW, one holland ditto, one pair womens half ſleeves, two pair linnen mittens, two fine womens handkerchiefs, one linen under-petticoat, one blue and white ſtriped linen ſhort gown, one pair corded dimity breeches, one half-worn ſheet, marked MT No. 13, one child's double ſhort gown and petticoat, two breadths belonging to a ſuit of ſtamped home-made cotton and linen curtains, ſtamped with large blue ſtripes and flowers, and bordered with black check ſtripes. They alſo took from ſome of Major Lee's Light Dragoons, quartered in the houſe, one pair cloth and one pair linen breeches, two horſemens red cloaks, one pair ſhoe and knee buckles, and a ſtock buckle, all ſilver, one black ſilk ſtock, one pair ſhoes, one fuſtian jacket, and a pair of leather gloves. The above reward will be given for ſecuring the goods, ſo that the owners may get them again, and the thieves ſecured in any goal where they may be proſecuted to conviction, or Two Hundred Dollars for the goods only, or in proportion for any part, paid by

July 21, 1780. ¶ JOHN TAYLOR.

Eaſt-Caln townſhip, Cheſter county, July 20, 1780.

Three Hundred Dollars Reward.

STOLEN on the night of the 8th inſt. out of the paſture of the ſubſcriber, living at the ſign of the Ship, on the Lancaſter road, A Bay GELDING, 5 years old, about 14½ hands high, low in fleſh, thin made, ſteep rump, low neck, and a light ſwitch tail, one white hind foot, paces and racks, good courage, carries head and tail well, branded on the near ſhoulder P P. and ſhod before when taken away. Whoever takes up and ſecures ſaid horſe and thief, ſo that the thief be brought to juſtice and the owner get his horſe again, ſhall have the above reward, or ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS, and reaſonable charges, for the horſe only, paid by

¶ JONATHAN VALENTINE.

Three Hundred Dollars Reward.

RAN AWAY, on the 26th of April laſt, from the ſubſcriber, living in Philadelphia, A Servant LAD, named JACOB LUTZ; he is a well ſet ſtout fellow, about 16 years of age, ſquints, and has a ſore on his right foot. His father lives in Berks county, at the Blue Mountains, near Fort Henry, commonly called Fort Sickes. Whoever takes up the ſaid lad, and ſecures him, ſo that his maſter may have him again, ſhall receive the above reward, paid by ¶ JOHN PHILIP DE HAAS.

BROKE into the paſture of the ſubſcriber, living in Lower Merion townſhip, Philadelphia county, about the 18th inſtant, A ſmall SORREL HORSE, with a ſtar in his forehead, and branded A on the near ſhoulder and buttock, ſuppoſed to be about three or four years old. The owner is deſired to come, prove his property, pay charges, and take him away.

July 21, 1780. ¶ DAVID ZELL.

Three Hundred Dollars Reward.

PICKED up off Stamper's wharf (the owner being poſitive to the ſpot) A common ſize SILVER WATCH, China face, ſteel chain and key, a cornelian ſtone ſeal, with the impreſſion of a man's head, ſet in ſilver, maker's name and number forgot: A Print of his Excellency General Waſhington in the bottom of the outſide caſe. As 'tis likely it will be offered for ſale, it is hoped that watchmakers and others to whom it may be offered will ſtop it, for which the above reward will be given by the Printers hereof, and no queſtions aſked. ¶

CAME to the plantation of the Subſcriber, in Haverford townſhip, Cheſter county, the 13th inſtant, A dark brown MARE, with a lock and clog on her foot. The owner is deſired to come, prove his property, pay charges, and take her away.

July 25, 1780. ¶ WILLIAM BROOKE.

RAN AWAY from the Conſtable of Horſham townſhip this day, A certain JAMES BRADFIELD, about 22 or 23 years of age, 5 feet 10 inches high, has black ſtrait hair, and is of a dark complexion. Whoever takes up the ſaid James Bradfield, and ſecures him in Philadelphia goal, ſhall receive a Reward of FOUR HUNDRED DOLLARS, and reaſonable charges, paid by

July 20, 1780. ‖ JOHN BARNS, Conſtable.

A YOUNG MAN, who underſtands Accompts, writes a good Hand, and can be well recommended, is willing to engage as a CLERK. Enquire at Bell's Book-Store, next Door to St. Paul's Church, Third-Street.

The caſe has been altered with us, ſince the Britiſh Parliament *forced* us to ſeparate ourſelves from their State. They have ſolemnly declared by an act of their Legiſlature, that we were NO MORE under their protection—NO MORE Britiſh Subjects. Let them explain as they can, the deſign of that impolitic artifice, it is evident that by this act they have deliberately abſolved us from our OATH OF ALLEGIANCE to Great-Britain. Unjuſt as they are, they do not pretend that we continue bound to their king, ſince he declared war againſt us with their approbation. All they expect is our *future* obedience, when it ſhall be founded upon what is called *the Right of Conqueſt*. Punctilioufly attentive as they were to remove the ſcruples of the moſt tender conſcience, is it not aſtoniſhing that we ſo long heſitated to accept from them the precious gift of Independence? They will not have us for their brethren; they have reſolved to conquer us.—We muſt be the Britiſh *Helots*, or remain free.

We have at laſt, tho' too reluctantly, acquieſced in our emancipation; but our inattention has been great. Congreſs has not yet recommended the anniverſary of that beneficence to be celebrated! Had one day been ordained to be kept, for the annual commemoration of that *Act*, all the advantages reſulting from the Parliamentary *Abſolution* would have then been minutely analized. Equivocating tories could no longer alarm the conſciences of the unthinking. Many of theſe are daily ſeduced by ſophiſtical concluſions, drawn from the declaration of our Independence, and the falſe ſuppoſition that our obligations continue in their full force.

That Declaration has transformed us all into beings of a ſuperior nature to what we were, when *no more* than Britons. Having, all of us, been bleſſed with the undeniable "honour of being born," we certainly are all *Men of Family*; we are all *Gentlemen*, all *Men of Birth*, whatever the ſelfiſh abettors of the feudal principles may alledge to the contrary. We are all *Eſquires*, of right and by duty; for, we are all equally bound to defend our country; a country, which it will be our fault if we do not really make ours. His Excellency the Commander in Chief has but the honour of being the FIRST *Eſquire* in the federal army, *wholly conſiſting* of *Eſquires*. The paltry *Title of Eſquire*, or *Bearer of Arms*, when applied to his Excellency, or any of us, in or out of the acting army, is therefore quite tautological, impertinent; A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE.

We are all, of right, COLLEGISLATORS in that ſtate, of which we are lawful members, within our Union. The ſhare we have in its legiſlation makes us all Lords—nay, real members of the ſovereignty of ſuch ſtate, whether or not we aſſume the title. We are indiſputably CO-SOVEREIGNS there; ſo that, "if there be one hundred thouſand members in it, each member enjoys the hundred "thouſandth part of its ſovereignty," and no more; but then he has a right to that, and is, ſo far, *Co-Sovereign* there. The Preſident, Governor, or Supreme Magiſtrate of that ſtate, can *lawfully* claim no more in his *individual* capacity, tho' he be authorized "to exerciſe the collective power of the whole." This is a ſacred truth, which, it is hoped, will ſoon be better underſtood, and duly reſpected; otherwiſe we ſhall be irrecoverably ruined. This right of *Co-Sovereignty* has been mentioned here, with no other deſign than to prove the conſtitutional right we derive from our happy ſituation, to ſtyle ourſelves LORDS, with more reality than the Britiſh Peers.

Should every one of the men who compoſe our union be indiſcriminately dignified with that title, and every woman with that of LADY, prefixed to their reſpective names, it would be unreaſonable to fear that hereditary diſtinctions will be excluſively inſtituted in any of our republics. *Lord* and *Lady* A, *the farmer*, and his *wife*, *Lord* John A, their *ſon*, and *Lady* Mary A, their *daughter*; *Lord* B, C or D, the *merchant*, *ſhop-keeper* or *carpenter*, are titles which cannot inſpire a republican with jealouſy, when granted with unconfined liberality. It is not the ſame with *Maſter* and *Miſtreſs* A. The original meaning and application of thoſe titles having long ſince been forgotten, become offenſive. They are ſometimes taken in a ſenſe which is injurious to liberty, and always falſe, when meant as compliments; but the titles of *Miſtreſs* or *Miſs* do not always pleaſe our worthieſt matrons or virgins. At the ſame time we ought to diſcountenance any perſon, who, tho' in deriſion, ſhall uſe the words MY LORD, &c. in the ſenſe, and on the occaſions, that will be reprobated. Religious, as well as political objects, are beheld with reverence, by thoſe who believe in God, and are worthy of being members of a free ſtate.

The cuſtom of prefixing theſe identical compliments of *Lord*, and *Lady*, to every name, has long ſince prevailed in different countries, without the moſt diſtant idea of the republican principle upon which it is now propoſed. DON is prefixed in Spain, and SIGNOR in Italy, to every man's name; DONA, amongſt the Spaniards, and SIGNORA, amongſt the Italians, are put before every woman's name. *Don* and *Signor* exactly ſignify *Lord*, as well as *Dona* and *Signora* ſignify Lady; but if an Italian mean in his own language to ſtyle any man *his* Lord, he ſays to him *Monſignor*, in Engliſh *My Lord*.

Maſter and *Miſtreſs* are originally two French words; they were formerly taken in the ſame ſenſe, and uſed by the French and Engliſh, to expreſs the ſame diſtinctions as *Lord* and *Lady* now do. *Lord* at that time was the ſtyle *excluſively* reſerved for the King, who was not yet complimented with MAJESTY. *Sir*, is another French word, *Sire*, and afterwards *Sieur*, which ſignified *Lord*; *Monſieur* was the form of the greateſt reſpect, as *My Lord* is, till cuſtom allowing the ſame compliment to every one, *Monſeigneur* was ſubſtituted for it. The latter continues to be uſed in that ſenſe in the French language, and theſe two forms, each conſiſting of two words, *Mon Sieur*, and *Mon Seigneur*, are each of them conſidered as one ſingle word.

The preceding obſervations upon the different ſignification of complimentary words, at different periods of time, were neceſſary in a publication of this kind. The Engliſh and other nations have occaſionally introduced new forms of addreſs. Their deſign was to adapt their ſtyle to the variations which they obſerved the language had undergone, when the old forms no more correſponded with the view of the addreſſer and addreſſed. Why, then, ſhould we heſitate, when it is ſo eaſy to introduce judicious alterations in our ſtyle, and for ever aboliſh abſurdities of the moſt dangerous tendency?

Truth and reaſon operate ſo forcibly, when men are unreſtrained by oppreſſion, that the new forms would be generally adopted in leſs than two months, with the leaſt encouragement from Congreſs. They would be ſo well eſtabliſhed that the Britiſh Lords, and the American *would-be-Peers*, their moſt ſtedfaſt friends on this ſide of the Atlantic, never could affect OUR FEDERAL PEERAGE. The Britiſh Peers have ſo ſcandalouſly abuſed the diſtinctions of theirs, that they well deſerve to loſe them all; they ought, at leaſt, to be *unmylorded* every where. *My Lord* will ſoon be conſidered as ſcurrilous banter.

Memorials and letters, directed to His Excellency *Lord* Samuel Huntington, Preſident &c. His Excellency *Lord* George Waſhington, Commander in Chief, &c. His Excellency *Lord* A, Governor or Preſident of. &c. will read better than the ſame names with the redundant diſtinction of *Eſquire*; nobody being *mylorded*, nor excluſively *lorded*, no humiliation to any member of our confederation can reſult from the propoſed reformation. It is, perhaps, one of the moſt efficacious and moſt ſeaſonable preventives that can be imagined. Our foreign friends will be pleaſed, on this principle, to ſee *Lords* Franklin, Adams, &c. introduced as *American Peers*.

Public ſafety being intereſted in this reformation, it will ſooner or later be adopted in this land of good ſenſe and freedom. It may take place, tho' more ſlowly, without the recommendation of Congreſs, if the multiplicity and importance of buſineſs fix their attention upon other objects. The meaſure does not interfere with their, nor any other legal authority known to us; it requires no exertion of the Executive Power. Our national reputation would be brighter, if they would take that honour upon themſelves; but the ſame ends may be obtained by our *extra-legiſlatorial* concurrence, IN TOWN or COUNTY MEETING. Any member may move it there; and the meaſure is ſo reaſonable, ſo pleaſant to every republican, that it is improbable that, if attempted, it would be overruled; for it is not to be preſumed that Congreſs will diſcourage the reformation.—In them, it would be ſelf-murder.

If that manifeſtation of our liberal intention begin out of Congreſs, our Delegates, our Aſſembly-men, and Magiſtrates;—our civil and military Officers;—our Farmers, Merchants and Tradeſmen;—Landholders, together with their Tenants, muſt cheerfully ſubmit to be *all at once created* LORDS. Our female patriots have already ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed themſelves, that they will be moved by ſuch powerful examples. Have we any reaſon to fear that they will not partake of our Peerage?—That the wives and daughters of *Whigs* will obſtinately perſiſt, for a long time, in diſdaining the title of LADIES?

A LORD of the Federal Peerage of America.

Philad. July 17, 1780, and in the 5th year of our Independence.

WILLIAM ADCOCK,

At the ſouth-eaſt corner of Second and Market-ſtreets, has for Sale,

A FEW Pieces of ſecond cloths, black ſerge denims, cambricks, lawns, book and other muſlins of the fineſt qualities, India dimities, perſians, Scots and coloured threads, ſuperfine white caſſimer, womens ſtuff ſhoes by trunk or dozen, &c. &c. Alſo a few caſks of vinegar.

N. B. Said Adcock receives goods to ſell on commiſſion. ¶

TO BE SOLD,

A STOUT able bodied HORSE, 5 years old laſt May, ſuitable for riding or draught; he is not ſold for any fault, but for want of employ, as the ſubſcriber has lately removed to Philadelphia. The horſe may be ſeen on Sellers's farm, in Upper Darby, Cheſter county, and the terms known, by applying at the ſaid place, or to the ſubſcriber, in Sixth-ſtreet, between Market and Arch-ſtreets, Philadelphia.

¶ DAVID SELLERS.

By his Excellency THOMAS SIM LEE, *Eſquire*, *Governor of Maryland*

A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS information hath been given to me, that on the night of the 27th of laſt month, the *Griſt-Mill*, *Saw-Mill*, and *Fulling-Mill*, late the property of Colonel *Iſaac Perkins* of Kent county, were burnt down, and that there is great reaſon to ſuſpect the ſaid mills were maliciouſly ſet on fire by ſome abandoned perſons:—For the diſcovery of, and bringing to condign puniſhment, the perpetrators of ſuch an attrocious crime,—I do hereby promiſe a PARDON to any perſon concerned in burning or ſetting fire to the ſaid mills (provided he or ſhe be not the principal) who ſhall firſt make diſcovery to a Magiſtrate of the Principal, and his or her accomplice or accomplices in the ſaid crime.

GIVEN at Annapolis, this fifth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thouſand ſeven hundred and eighty.

THOMAS S. LEE.

By his Excellency's Command,
T. JOHNSON, *jun. Secr'y.*

GOD SAVE the STATE.

Five Thouſand Dollars Reward.

WILL be given by the ſubſcriber to any perſon (the principal concerned excepted) that ſhall firſt diſcover to a Magiſtrate of Kent county, the principal, and his or her accomplices, concerned in burning or ſetting fire to my MILLS on the night of the 27th of laſt month, ſo that he, ſhe or they be proſecuted to conviction.

ISAAC PERKINS.

N. B. A MILLWRIGHT, that can come well recommended, is wanted immediately, to re-build ſaid Mills.

July 8, 1780. † I. P.

WANTED on LOAN,

THE ſum of SIXTY THOUSAND CONTINENTAL DOLLARS, for three months, for which a good premium will be given, and double ſecurity in goods depoſited. Enquire of the Printers.

Three Hundred Dollars Reward.

RAN AWAY from the ſubſcriber, living in Montgomery townſhip, Philadelphia county, on the 12th of July, 1780, An Apprentice Boy, named JOSEPH COLLINS (though he may call himſelf Morgan) about 14 years of age, well ſet, fair complexion, ſandy hair, had ſeveral warts on the back of his hands, ſlow motioned, and has an aukward look: Had on when he went away, a homeſpun ſhirt, brown ſtriped linen breeches, and an old hat. Whoever ſecures ſaid Collins, ſo as his maſter may have him again, ſhall have the above reward, or if brought home, *Four Hundred Dollars*, and reaſonable charges, paid by JOHN MORGAN.

All Maſters of veſſels are forbid to carry him off, and all others not to harbour, conceal or detain him, at their peril. ‖

TO BE SOLD,

A VALUABLE PLANTATION, in Croſwicks, four miles from Bordentown, quantity 226 acres, now in the tenure of William Willſon.

Alſo a very valuable PLANTATION in the townſhip of Waterford, eleven miles from Cooper's Ferry, quantity 440 acres, now in the tenure of Benjamin Pine. A view of the premiſes will give the beſt idea of the quality of the land, and of the improvements. For terms apply to the ſubſcriber, in Burlington.

GEORGE BOWNE.

July 10, 1780.

TAKEN up by the ſubſcriber, living at the Crooked Billet, Philadelphia county, on the 4th of this inſt. July, a bright bay HORSE, about 14 hands high, ſuppoſed to be 12 years old. Alſo a bay MARE, 3 years old, near 14 hands high, ſuppoſed to have ſtrayed from Philadelphia. The owners proving their property, and paying charges, may have them again.

† BENJAMIN THOMAS.

DESERTED from my Quarters, at Mr. Jonathan Penroſe's, in Front-ſtreet, Philadelphia, on the 14th inſt. A certain JOHN WILLSON, a ſoldier in my regiment: He is better than ſix feet high, has black ſhort hair, is ſomewhat lame, and is a native of Ireland. He had on when he went away, only a white blanket jacket and a pair of blue overalls, having left his uniform behind. At the ſame time, he ſtole one of my waggon Horſes, a bright ſorrel, about 14 hands high, ſwitch tail, a bald face, and branded C A on the near ſhoulder. Whoever takes up and ſecures ſaid deſerter and horſe, ſo that I may have them again, ſhall receive ONE HALF JOHANNES, or the value thereof at the current exchange.

FRANCIS JOHNSTON,
Colonel 5th P. Regiment.

FIFTY DOLLARS Reward.

RAN AWAY from the ſubſcriber, An Apprentice Lad, named JOHN HALL, proved to be on board the ſhip Jay, Captain Coarter, Commander. Whoever ſecures ſaid apprentice, and returns him to his maſter, ſhall be entitled to the above reward, paid by

§ ISAAC FORSYTH.

Fifty Dollars Reward.

RUN away, on the 8th inſtant, from the ſubſcriber, living in Coomb's Alley, Philadelphia, an apprentice lad, named Owen O Gublin, near 18 years of age, ſlender made, with ſtrait black hair; had on, when he went away, a homeſpun ſhirt and trowſers, round hat, half worn ſhoes and braſs buckles. Whoever takes up ſaid apprentice, and brings him home to his maſter, ſhall have the above reward, paid by

JAMES WORSTALL.

N. B. All Maſters of veſſels and others, are deſired not to harbour or take him away at their peril. *

Philadelphia, July 7, 1780.

THE Committee of Public Accounts will attend at the Chamber of Accounts, in the State-Houſe at Philadelphia, from the 21ſt of Auguſt next until the 1ſt of September, in order to ſettle the Public Accounts of the State Treaſurer, General Loan Office, Light-Houſe rates, Duties of Slaves, Collectors of Exciſe, State-Iſland, County Commiſſioners and Treaſurers: The above officers are hereby requeſted to take notice, and give their attendance with their proper Vouchers and Accounts.

MICHAEL SHUBART,
WILLIAM COATS,
DANIEL HEISTER,
WILLIAM HARRIS,
JAMES JACKS,
JONATHAN HOGE,
SAMUEL DALE,
} Committee of Accounts.

Philadelphia, July 10, 1780.

One Thouſand Dollars Reward.

RAN away this morning from the ſubſcriber, a Negroe wench named MARIA, alias AMORITTA; ſhe is about thirty-four years of age, tall and well made, her face long, and features more regular than are common with her colour: She had on, or took with her, a pale blue and white fine ſhort linſey gown and petticoat almoſt new, a petticoat of green baize, a pair of new high-heeled leather ſhoes, good ſhifts of brown homeſpun linen, and aprons of the ſame. It is ſuppoſed ſhe will endeavour to get into the Jerſeys, as ſhe came from thence, and once lived with Mr. Thomas Lowrey, of Flemmington; but it is ſuſpected ſhe is now lurking in this city, or concealed by ſome free negroes.

She alſo took with her, her female child named JANE, about 4 years old, well made, fat, round faced, and lively: had on, or took with her, a brown homeſpun frock; alſo a blue and white linſey frock.

Whoever will deliver the ſaid wench and child to the ſubſcriber in Philadelphia, ſhall have the above reward.

JOHN DUFFIELD.

N. B All perſons are forbid to harbour her at their peril.

WANTED,

AN HOSTLER, that will undertake the Care of twenty Horſes. None need apply but ſuch as can be well recommended. Enquire of the Printers.

PHILADELPHIA: Printed by HALL and SELLERS, at the NEW-PRINTING-OFFICE, near the MARKET.